

Remark/Arguments

Claims 1 to 35 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 9-12, 14, 19, 21-25, 27, and 29 stand rejected. Claims 30-35 are allowed, and claims 3-8, 13, 15-18, 20, 26, and 28 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Reconsideration and reexamination in view of the amendments herein is requested.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejection

Claim 11 stands rejected due to insufficient antecedent basis. The dependency of claim 11 has been amended from claim 9 to claim 10. This amendment is believed to overcome the 112 rejection.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 23, 24, 25, 27 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b): as being anticipated by Bacich (USPN 4,733,945). Claims 9, 10, 12, 14, 19, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Bacich as applied to claims 1, 2, 23, 24, 25 and 27, and further in view of Spinali. As discussed below, neither Bacich nor Spinali teach or suggest an element of these claims as amended. Accordingly, these claims are believed patentable.

Bacich discloses an optical element holding device for vertically translating a lens cell insert 175. As shown in Fig. 17 and described in column 11, lines 41-63, the translation of the lens cell insert 175 is accomplished by screw 184.

Spinali (USPN 6,400,516) discloses a kinematic optical mounting a fixed stopping pad 162 and a flexible pad 164 which are arranged in tangential direction T of a lens 110. The pad 164 is formed by a spring 165 and a contact pad 167.

However, both of the cited references fail to disclose or suggest a feature of the claimed invention, "a drive mechanism that changes at least one of an amount of displacement of a drive element and a displacement direction of the drive element." This claimed element is lacking from both references. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 23, 24, 25, 27 and 29, which all include at least this limitation, are not anticipated and are believed patentable over Bacich (cited in the 102 rejection).

Claims 9, 10, 12, 14, 19, 21, and 22, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a), depend from claims believed patentable as discussed above, and are likewise believed to be patentable.

Moreover, as discussed above, both Bacich and Spinali fail to teach or suggest "a drive mechanism that changes at least one of an amount of displacement of a drive element and a displacement direction of the drive element" which is in the claims as amended. An obviousness rejection requires that the proposed combination teach or suggest all claim limitations. As all claim limitations are not taught or suggested by the combination of Bacich and Spinali, claims 9, 10, 12, 14, 19, 21, and 22 are not obvious and are believed patentable.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, claims 1 to 35 are believed patentable.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 3, 2003



Gary A. Hecht, Reg. 36,826
Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP
2600 Aramark Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107
Telephone: (215): 923-4466
Facsimile: (215): 923-2189

GAH/pmf

M:\GHecht\Onda Techno\24943\PTO\03-03-2003Response.doc